

'In considering the weight of the opinion expressed above, the Commission should be advised that the Pander Society represents some 250 students of conodonts in 30 countries and is the official working group on conodonts of the International Paleontological Association. Furthermore, tabulation of the results of the questionnaire on the "*Gnathodus* question" by country, continent, and area of specialization shows no significant difference, exhibits no geographic or political bias, and indicates to me that those members who were concerned with the question at all considered the alternatives strictly on their merits.' (Professor Sweet to Secretary, 16 December 1983).

Some explanation of the taxonomic considerations underlying the choice of a substitute type species for *Gnathodus* may be in order. From the first discovery of conodonts by Pander in 1856 until 1934, they were known only as isolated single skeletal elements of very diverse tooth-like forms. A large number of genera based on these elements were erected to contain, eventually, over 4,000 species.

From 1934 on there began to be collected specimens in which a number of skeletal elements occurred, apparently in a natural relationship to one another, and in most cases consisting of sets of markedly different elements that had been referred to different single-element genera. For a while these discoveries gave rise to a dual nomenclature in conodonts, but since 1966 a single apparatus-based nomenclature, applying the Law of Priority to single element-based names, has become universal. If, therefore, the Commission's decision in this case is to produce the desired stability of nomenclature, it is clearly desirable that so important a genus as *Gnathodus*, to which some 80, mainly Lower Carboniferous, species have been referred, should be based on a type species whose taxonomic position is secure by present-day criteria. This is not true of *G. texanus* Roundy, 1926, and still less so of *G. mosquensis* Pander, 1856. It is, however, true of *Polygnathus bilineatus* Roundy, 1926, a species now referred to *Gnathodus*.

Dr Ziegler and Dr Lane, the original applicants in this case, have just published in *Senckenbergiana Iethaea*, vol. 65, nos. 1-2, pp. 257-263, 1 pl., 1984, an illustrated account of a complete apparatus of *G. bilineatus* (Roundy) and propose that this, rather than *G. texanus* Roundy, should be designated as the type species of *Gnathodus*.

This entails the following changes to the formal proposals published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 61:

in paragraph 10(1), for *Gnathodus texanus* Roundy, 1926, read *Polygnathus bilineatus* Roundy, 1926;

in paragraph 10(3), for *texanus* Roundy, 1926 as published in the binomen *Gnathodus texanus*, read *bilineatus* Roundy, 1926 as published in the binomen *Polygnathus bilineatus*.

CAECILIIDAE IN AMPHIBIA AND INSECTA (PSOCOPTERA):
REPLY TO SMITH, LANHAM AND POLHEMUS. Z.N.(S.)2333
(see vol. 40, pp. 124-128; vol. 41, pp. 108-109)

By Thomas E. Moore (*University of Michigan, Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1079, U.S.A.*)

Ronald A. Nussbaum, Edward L. Mockford and I had considered and rejected the name CAECILIAIDAE because of its inherent difficulty in pronunciation,

because of its unexpected spelling and form, and because our recommended move follows normal priority. We had similarly rejected CAECILIUSIDAE. We still strongly favour our original proposal. Our choice of CAECILIONIDAE was based on priority, ease of pronunciation, ease of spelling, and ease of association with psocid names previously used under CAECILIIDAE. CAECILIONIDAE seems far more euphonious to us than CAECILIAIDAE or CAECILIUSIDAE. Psocids are not particularly widely or popularly discussed animals, the family-group names surrounding CAECILIIDAE have been in a state of flux between 1903 (first use) and 1978 (Mockford's summary of the usage of names), and only a relatively few authors have used this group name in insects; so very few would have to change their ways. We recognise here no special case based on usage or significance or probable confusion to justify not following the nomenclatural principle of priority. We hope our proposal will satisfy the preferences of most current herpetologists and entomologists, particularly specialists on psocids.

In case there are substantial numbers who think that it is too far-fetched to claim that the stem of *Caecilius*, for the purposes of Article 29, can ever be CAECILION-, we reluctantly suggest that *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837, be replaced by a junior synonym; and since we know of no such synonym in the literature, we hereby propose *Caecilonis* (arbitrary combination of letters; gender: masculine), type species *Caecilius fenestratus* Curtis, 1837, as a new replacement name. The stem of this name, for the purposes of Article 29, is CAECILION-. The generic name can only become nomenclaturally valid by the suppression of *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, and we add a request for the use of the plenary powers to that effect to our original proposals.

A COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE A NEOTYPE FOR
ADIANTHUS BUCATUS AMEGHINO, 1891 (MAMMALIA) UNDER THE
PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 2430
(see vol. 41, p. 56-57)

By Robert M. Schoch (*Division of Science, College of Basic Studies, Boston University, 871 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass., 02215 U.S.A.*)

Cifelli & Soria, 1984, propose that a hemimandible (Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales, Ameghino Collection no. 1812 = M.A.C.N. no. A1812) be designated the neotype of *Adiantus bucatatus* Ameghino, 1891. They make this proposal explicitly in order to apply the name *Adiantus bucatatus* Ameghino, 1891, to a species different from that to which this name was originally applied. I believe that their arguments and reasoning are of insufficient strength to warrant such a radical move by the Commission.

2. As Cifelli & Soria (1984, p. 56) admit, Ameghino's (1891, p. 134, fig. 31) description and figure of the original type specimen upon which the name *Adiantus bucatatus* is based are adequate to recognise this distinct species and to make the name available. In the course of that original description of *Adiantus bucatatus*, Ameghino also coined the name ADIANTHIDAE Ameghino, 1891, initially including only